

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10, 12-14, 16, 20-24, and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over United States Patent Publication 2005/0263591 by Smith (hereinafter Smith) in view of United States Patent Number 6,570,884 to Connery et al. (hereinafter Connery).

Amendments to the Claims

Applicants have amended claim 1 with the limitation “...wherein an invalid interface address is selected from an address outside of a specified address range and an address not of a specified device ...” The amendment is fully supported by the specification. See pages 8-9, ¶ 35. Claims 10, 16, 24, and 30 are similarly amended. Claims 3, 8, 12, 20, and 27 are canceled.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10, 12-14, 16, 20-24, and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Smith in view of Connery. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1, 10, 16, 24, and 30 include the limitation “...**determine whether the interface address is invalid...**” and “...**mitigate an invalid interface address by deactivating the network...**” See claim 1. See also claims 10, 16, 24, and 30. Claims 1, 10, 16, 24, and 30 further include the limitation “...the interface address is an Ethernet media access controller address...” See claim 1.

In contrast, Smith teaches detecting Radio Frequency (RF) tags. Smith, page 1, ¶ 3.

Applicants find no teaching in Smith of determining whether an Ethernet media access controller (MAC) address is invalid or of mitigating an invalid MAC address by deactivating a network. Connery teaches an Ethernet network and devices with MAC addresses. Connery, col. 3, ¶ 29-60; col. 4, lines 52-67, fig. 1. However, Connery also does not disclose determining whether a MAC address is invalid and mitigating an invalid MAC address by deactivating a network. Because Smith and Connery do not teach determining whether a MAC is invalid and mitigating the invalid MAC address by deactivating a network, Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 10, 16, 24, and 30 are allowable.

Applicants have further amended claims 1, 10, 16, 24, and 30 with the limitation “...wherein an invalid interface address is selected from an address outside of a specified address range and an address not of a specified device ...” Applicants submit that Smith’s teaching of tags being outside of the physical range of a message is not analogous to an invalid MAC address being outside of a specified address range. See Smith, page 6, ¶ 46. In addition, neither Smith nor Connery discloses a MAC address being invalid if not of a specified device. Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 10, 16, 24, and 30 as amended are allowable.

Applicants further submit that claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 21-23, 28, and 29 are allowable as depending from allowable claims. Claims 3, 8, 12, 20, and 27 are canceled.

Conclusion

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that the application is in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the

rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: May 19, 2008
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929